

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the undersigned and Mr. Brisnehan in the personal interview of May 2, 2006. During the interview, the *Hughes* and *Dutta et al.* references cited in the Office Action were discussed, as were potential amendments to independent claims 1, 12, 16, and 20, and possible new claims to overcome the art of record.

The non-final Office Action of February 22, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. By this amendment, the specification has been amended, claims 1, 12, 16, and 20 have been amended, claims 2-4 and 9-10 have been cancelled, and claims 23-27 have been added. Claims 1, 5-8, and 12-27 are thus now pending in this application. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleges that “[t]he specification fails to provide support for a data structure containing a plugin.” Office Action, page 3. The Applicants respectfully traverse.

The specification has been amended to support a software envelope “contain[ing] the data file and the plugin object.” Support for this specification amendment is found in claim 17 of the application as originally filed. Specification, page 16, lines 5-6. Further, this amendment is consistent with several other portions of the specification relating to plugins as attachments contained within software envelope data structures. For example, Fig. 5 shows an “<attachment>” tag within a “<manifest>” tag, and Fig. 3 shows a “<manifest>” tag within an “<envelope>” tag. These figures, in conjunction with descriptions in the specification, such as, “[i]n one embodiment of the invention, a plugin or parser may be attached to the software envelope” (Specification, page 12, line 20 – page 13, line 1), and “[t]he present invention also allows for the attachment of one or more files to the software envelope by describing the attachments between a pair of <attachment> tags 510 for each attached file.” (Specification, page 11, lines 8-10), clearly describe a “data structure ... containing a plugin,” as recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection Over Hughes and Dutta Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6-8, 10, 16, 19-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,372 to Hughes (“Hughes”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,212 to Dutta et al. (“Dutta”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1, as amended, recites the step of “generating a plugin based on the predetermined schema, said plugin configured to create an object from the markup language of the data file.” Amended claim 1 further recites, “the plugin creating the object.” These steps are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

Hughes relates to templates, and although the Office Action appears to consider a template equivalent to a plugin (Office Action, page 2), Applicants disagree with this characterization. As is well-known in the art, a plugin is an executable software program. In contrast, Hughes templates are simply text descriptions of the data that may assist the receiver in interpreting the data. Hughes, Col. 8, lines 26-29. Hughes provides the following template description:

An example of a template is shown below:
Pay to the order of A the amount
B from the account of C.

Hughes, Col. 9, lines 32-34. Thus, Hughes’ template is merely another metadata property, such as file type, file size, author, or any other descriptive property. Since Hughes’ template is not executable software, it thus cannot be a “plugin,” as recited in claim 1.

Hughes’ templates are further distinguishable in that they are not “configured to create an object from the markup language of the data file,” as recited in claim 1. Hughes templates are mere text descriptions of the data; they are not capable of being executed to perform a function as are plugins. Following the previous analogy, simply because a file type field (e.g., “JPG image”) provides some information about the data, this field is not itself configured to create an object from the data. Thus, Hughes does not teach or suggest a “plugin ... configured to create an object from ... the data file,” or “the plugin creating the object,” as recited in claim 1.

Dutta discloses a plugin, but only as a viewer for a media type that the client is not equipped to view. Dutta, Col. 7, line 63 – Col. 8, line 11. Dutta never discloses “generating a plugin,” and Dutta’s plugins are not “based on [a] predetermined schema,” as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, the plugins in Dutta provide a viewer for a media file of a foreign type, but no

plugin disclosed in Dutta creates an object. Thus, Dutta further fails to teach or suggest, “generating a plugin ... configured to create an object from the markup language of the data file,” or “the plugin creating the object,” as recited in amended claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that amended claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, are allowable over Hughes, Dutta, and their proposed combination.

Independent claims 16 and 20 similarly recite, “[a] plugin configured to create an object from the markup language of the data file,” and claim 20 further recites, “the plugin creating the object.” Thus, for similar reasons as discussed above, claims 16, 20, and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Hughes and Dutta, either alone or in combination.

Additionally, claims 16 and 20 have been further amended to recite a “plugin correspond[ing] to the operating system” of the receiver. This additional feature is neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited references, and is supported in the specification, for instance as follows:

The appropriate plugin may depend upon the operating system utilized by the destination location. For example, a first plugin may extract the information contained in the data file shown in figure 6 and rehydrate the information into an object recognized by the first operating system. Furthermore, a second plugin may be used to extract and rehydrate the same information into an object recognized by a second operating system.

Specification, page 12, lines 16-20. For this additional reason, claims 16, 20, and their respective dependent claims are allowable over the cited references.

Rejection Over Hughes, Dutta, and Chen, Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Dutta, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,856 to Chen et al. (“Chen”). Claims 2-4 have been cancelled and replaced by claims 23-24 to better clarify features of the claimed invention. Claims 23 and 24 depend from allowable claim 20 and are thus themselves allowable. Additionally, since Chen does not teach or suggest plugins, it fails to overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Hughes and Dutta with respect to independent claim 20. Accordingly, claims 23-24 are also allowable.

Rejection Over Hughes, Dutta, and Lektion, Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Dutta and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,110 to Lektion et al.

("Lection"). Claims 5, 18, and 21 depend from allowable claims 1, 16, and 20, respectively, and are thus themselves allowable. However, Lection also does not teach or suggest plugins. Thus, it similarly fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hughes and Dutta discussed above in relation to independent claims 1, 16, and 20. Accordingly, claims 5, 18, and 21 are also allowable.

Rejection Over Hughes, Chen, and "Official Notice," Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Dutta and further in view of alleged "Official Notice." Claim 8 depends from allowable claim 1 and are thus also allowable. Moreover, the Official Notice used to reject claim 8 does not overcome the deficiencies discussed above with Hughes and Chen with regard to independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is also allowable.

Rejection Over Lection and Dutta Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lection in view of Dutta. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 12 recites, in part, "a plugin configured to create an object from the markup language comprising the data file in accordance with the predetermined schema." For similar reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, the proposed combination of Lection and Dutta does not teach or suggest this aspect of claim 12. Dutta discloses a plugin, but fails to teach plugins which create objects from the markup language of the data file, as claimed. Additionally, since Lection does not teach plugins, it fails to overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Dutta. Claims 13-15, dependent back to claim 12, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Additionally, claim 12 has been amended to recite "a data field containing a plugin." As stated above in regards to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection asserted by the Office Action, the specification supports a data structure "containing a plugin." Specification, e.g., page 16, lines 5-6. Neither Lection, nor Dutta, nor any other cited reference teaches or suggests a data structure "containing a plugin," as recited in amended claim 12. Accordingly, claim 12 and dependent claims 13-15 are allowable over the asserted references, either alone or in combination, for this additional reason.

New Claims

Claims 23-27 have been added based on claim 1 and reciting additional features to distinguish the present invention over the art of record.

For instance, claim 25 recites, in part, “wherein the software envelope contains the plugin.” As stated above in relation to claim 12, this feature is supported by the specification as filed, and is not specifically disclosed in Hughes, Dutta, or any of the other cited references. Only Dutta discloses sending a plugin, but does not teach or suggest the plugin contained in a software envelope. Accordingly, Applicants submit that new claim 25 is allowable over the cited references for this additional reason.

Claim 26 recites, in part, “determining a first data field in the plurality of data fields as an optional data field based on the plugin,” and “determining a second data field in the plurality as a required data field based on the plugin.” Neither Hughes, nor Dutta, nor any of the other cited references teaches or suggests an “optional data field” or a “required data field” in the data file, as recited by claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants submit that new claim 26 is allowable over the cited references for this additional reason.

Claim 27, recites, in part, “wherein generating the plugin is based on said operating system .” As discussed above in relation to claims 16 and 20, neither Hughes, nor Dutta, nor any of the other cited references teach or suggest a plugin based on an operating system. Accordingly, Applicants submit that new claim 27 is allowable over the cited references for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3150.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 22, 2006

By: /Jordan N. Bodner/
Jordan N. Bodner
Registration No. 42,338

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

JNB/bjb/tsh